

**Remarks**

Claims 8, 10, 11, and 22-28 are still pending in the application. Claims 8, 10, 11, 22-28 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-21 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 4, 16, 18, 25 and 26 and has required clarification of the preamble and the body of the claims. The Examiner has requested that the Applicant add limitations of claim 3 into claim 12. The Examiner has also requested that the Applicant add the limitations of claim 4 into claim 25 (presumably 27). The Examiner has also suggested particular language for claims 12, 13, 27 and 28. Claims 2 through 7, 9 through 13, 16, 18, 19, and 22 through 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Temple. The Examiner has, however, indicated that claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In responding to these objections and rejections, the Applicant has cancelled claims 9 and 12 through 21 and has redirected the invention to the substantial limitations of allowable claim 8, redrafted in independent form. In order to enhance the clarity and conciseness thereof, some changes have been made to the wording, which are believed not to be of a material nature. Moreover, the preamble of claim 8 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's request with respect to previous claim 4 (now cancelled). Furthermore, the features cited in previous claim 7 (now cancelled) to which previous claim 8 referred have been omitted, since the feature of "... a parameter (...) system" cited in claim 8 as amended is "a priori knowledge" and accordingly the wording of previous claim 7 is redundant. Claims 10, 11, 22, have been amended to be

dependent on claim 8. Furthermore, a minor inconsistency in claim 22 has been discovered and amended by replacing the term "a priori information" with -- a priori knowledge --. Claims 25, 26 and 27 have been amended to recite features corresponding to those of amended claim 8. Claims 27, 28 have also been amended following the suggestion of the Examiner.

Since claim 8 has been redrafted to independent form, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 as amended is now allowable. Claims 25, 26 and 27 have been amended to recite features corresponding to those of amended claim 8, and are therefore submitted to be allowable as well. Claims 10, 11, 22-24 and 28 are dependent on either claim 8, claim 25, claim 26 or claim 27 and are therefore also allowable as well. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections identified in the Office Action have been met and grant of a patent with the claims as amended herewith is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

11

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Reg. No. 37,461

Feb. 12, 2009

Date

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steinle & Becker  
Patentanwälte  
Postfach 10 37 62  
D-70032 Stuttgart  
Federal Republic of Germany  
Telephone: ++49/711-24 89 38-0  
Fax:            ++49/711-24 89 38-99